

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/774,753 02/09/2004 Ac Kwon Yoo 1768-51-3 / 6132 10214.12014/U 7590 07/05/2007 **EXAMINER** GRAYBEAL, JACKSON, HALEY LLP 155 - 108TH AVENUE NE HOOK, JAMES F **SUITE 350** ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER BELLEVUE, WA 98004-5973 3754 MAIL DATE **DELIVERY MODE** 07/05/2007 **PAPER**

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	H		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/774,753	YOO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James F. Hook	3754	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	·
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI e, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communi BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
· <u> </u>	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the mer	its is
closed in accordance with the practice under t	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.[). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			·
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	·		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.	÷		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- · ·		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	
The path of declaration is objected to by the E.	xammer. Note the attache	d Office Action of form 710-13	12.,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:			
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 			
2. Certified copies of the priority document3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority		•	۵
application from the International Burea	·	rreceived in this Hational Olagi	•
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	t received.	
	·		
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 		Informal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-9-04</u> .	6) 🔲 Other:	·	

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner notes that in claim 2, line 10 of the claim, the word "brining" appears to be misspelled and should appear as "bringing", if such is the case, it is requested that applicant correct the spelling in any subsequent response to this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood (063). The patent to Wood discloses the recited method of repairing and reinforcing an underground pipe comprising inserting a mold made of flexible material through the interior of a reinforcing element 12 of a fiber perform surrounded by an impermeable inner and outer layers 16,26 where the inner mold is combined with the reinforcing element, positioning the combined element which includes the reinforcing element and the inner mold into an underground pipe to be repaired 70, injecting and expanding the inner mold with a high temperature fluid to bring the reinforcing element into close contact with an inner wall of the underground pipe, injecting the reinforcing element with thermosetting resin, and where the inner mold 26 after inversion can be removed, where air or water can be used to expand the mold, the fibrous sheet material

can be felt, woven, knitted or rovings of glass or various synthetic fibers, the resin used can be polyester or epoxy, where the epoxy can be injected by puncturing a tube into the sealed mold, where a plurality of sleeves can be used which would require a repeating of the injecting and expanding procedure after the first to create a multiple lined pipe section.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood (063) in view of Catallo. The patent to Wood discloses all of the recited structure with the exception of providing a tube punctured into the mold to allow for the escape of air. The patent to Catallo discloses that it is old and well known in the art to provide a pipe with openings 18 through a tube 12 which is inserted into the space between inner and outer liner sheets to allow the removal of air from a felt material to insure the connection of the felt liner to the pipe it is being used to repair. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the mold in Wood with a vent tube for allowing the removal of air during the addition of resin to the felt material to insure a proper complete impregnating of the felt material as suggested by Catallo to prevent premature failure of the liner thereby saving money in repair costs.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood (063). The patent to Wood discloses all of the recited structure with the exception of rolling the reinforcing element and mold before insertion rather than the stacking method used in Wood. It is considered merely a choice of mechanical expedients to provide the liner to the place to be lined in any manner including rolling the liner where such is merely a choice of mechanical expedients and one skilled in the art would only require routine experimentation to arrive at an optimum way to provide the liner to the job site where such is a mere equivalent way to provide the liner in a compact manner, where rolling or folding are considered equivalent and only routine skill is required to decide between the two methods, where rolling would prevent creases that the folding step would provide to the liner thereby causing weak spots that may fail.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon in view of Catalla. The patent to Lyon discloses the recited method of repairing and reinforcing an underground pipe comprising inserting a mold made of flexible material through the interior of a reinforcing element 18 of a fiber perform surrounded by an impermeable inner and outer layers 16,14 where the inner mold is combined with the reinforcing element, positioning the combined element which includes the reinforcing element and the inner mold into an underground pipe to be repaired 12, expanding the inner mold with air to bring the reinforcing element into close contact with an inner wall of the underground pipe, injecting the reinforcing element with thermosetting resin via pipes 40,42 provided between the mold layers, where air can be used to expand the mold, where the liner is provided in a U shape into the pipe. The patent to Lyon

Application/Control Number: 10/774,753

Art Unit: 3754

discloses all of the recited structure with the exception of providing a tube punctured into the mold to allow for the escape of air. The patent to Catallo discloses that it is old and well known in the art to provide a pipe with openings 18 through a tube 12 which is inserted into the space between inner and outer liner sheets to allow the removal of air from a felt material to insure the connection of the felt liner to the pipe it is being used to repair. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the mold in Lyon with a vent tube for allowing the removal of air during the addition of resin to the felt material to insure a proper complete impregnating of the felt material as suggested by

Catallo to prevent premature failure of the liner thereby saving money in repair costs.

Claims 2, 3, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon in view of Wood (063). The patent to Lyon discloses all of the recited structure with the exception of removing the inner liner, providing a second lining step, and rolling the liner. It is considered merely a choice of mechanical expedients to provide the liner to the place to be lined in any manner including rolling the liner where such is merely a choice of mechanical expedients and one skilled in the art would only require routine experimentation to arrive at an optimum way to provide the liner to the job site where such is a mere equivalent way to provide the liner in a compact manner, where rolling or folding are considered equivalent and only routine skill is required to decide between the two methods, where rolling would prevent creases that the folding step would provide to the liner thereby causing weak spots that may fail. It would have been obvious to modify the method in Lyon by providing the steps of removing a portion of the mold and providing a second lining step as suggested by Wood as such would

provide two liners in sections that require a thicker liner to prevent premature wear and where it is an equivalent procedure to either leave the mold in tact or remove a portion of it where such is an equivalent manner to line a pipe.

Claims 4, 5, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon in view of Wood (063) as applied to claims 2, 3, and 7 above, and further in view of Catalla. The patent to Lyon as modified discloses all of the recited structure with the exception of providing a tube punctured into the mold to allow for the escape of air. The patent to Catallo discloses that it is old and well known in the art to provide a. pipe with openings 18 through a tube 12 which is inserted into the space between inner and outer liner sheets to allow the removal of air from a felt material to insure the connection of the felt liner to the pipe it is being used to repair. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the mold in Lyon as modified with a vent tube for allowing the removal of air during the addition of resin to the felt material to insure a proper complete impregnating of the felt material as suggested by Catallo to prevent premature failure of the liner thereby saving money in repair costs.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references to Hall, Masaaki, Wood (553), Stephens (967 and 378), Endoh, Kiest, Jr. (619 and 280), and Manners disclosing state of the art lining methods for pipes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James F. Hook whose telephone number is (571) 272-4903. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday, work at home Thursdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit 3754

JFH